

Application No. 10/082,525
Amendment

Page 7

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 were pending in the application. Claims 1-20 were rejected. Claims 1 and 8 are canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Claims 2-7, 9-12, 14-16, and 18-20 are amended. Claims 21 and 22 are added. Claims 2-7 and 9-22 are now pending in the application. Claims 21 and 22 are the independent claims. Reconsideration of the amended application is respectfully requested.

The examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 USC §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. New independent claims 21 and 22 recite the invention in a manner that is directed to statutory subject matter. Claim 21 recites a process of searching network resources that includes an implementation action and does not include only mental steps or manipulation of abstract ideas. Claim 22 recites a framework for creating a search system that is stored on a computer-readable medium. The remaining claims depend from claims 21 and 22. The rejection, therefore, should be withdrawn.

The examiner rejected claims 1-18 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Motoyama et al. The examiner also rejected claims 19 and 20 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sondur et al.

Claim 21 recites a process of searching network resources, which includes establishing a first search framework tier defining sources/resources API, and establishing a second search framework tier providing specific implementations of the sources/resources API. An action is described in the first search framework tier corresponding to a search. Functions are implemented as defined in the API according to the described action, in the second tier.

Application No. 10/082,525
Amendment

Page 8

Claim 22 recites a framework, stored on computer-readable media, for creating a search system. The framework includes an abstraction layer to provide a user with a common interface to heterogeneous network objects. The abstraction layer includes source/resource API defined through at least one virtual NetResource class, a tree of accessible/searchable objects built of NetResource types, at least one manager class, at least one resource handle, and at least one thread class. The NetResource types represent the source/resource API through a set of virtual functions. The at least one NetResource class creates the abstraction layer between a common set of functions in the API and specific implementations that support the API.

In contrast, Motoyama et al. disclose a system and method for interfacing two modules supporting various applications. The Motoyama et al. system is object oriented, and provides for an interface between an application software module and a processing software module supporting various applications, in effect allowing for document or file translation. Motoyama et al. make a data object accessible to a central processor to facilitate data sharing. A preferred embodiment of the Motoyama et al. invention provides for transformation of documents written in mark-up languages.

Thus, Motoyama et al. are concerned with translation and sharing of documents between applications, but are not concerned with searching network resources. That is, Motoyama et al. do not establish or suggest a first search framework tier defining sources/resources API, or a second search framework tier providing specific implementations of the sources/resources API, as recited in claim 21. Further, Motoyama et al. do not describe or suggest an action in the first search framework tier corresponding

Application No. 10/082,525
Amendment

Page 9

to a search, or implement functions as defined in the API according to the described action, in the second tier, as recited in claim 21. Motoyama et al. do not disclose or suggest an abstraction layer that includes source/resource API defined through at least one virtual NetResource class, a tree of accessible/searchable objects built of NetResource types, at least one manager class, at least one resource handle, and at least one thread class, as recited in claim 22. NetResource types are defined as representing the source/resource API through a set of virtual functions, and the NetResource class is defined as creating the abstraction layer between a common set of functions in the API and specific implementations that support the API.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Motoyama et al. do not render obvious the invention as recited in claims 21 and 22. Claims 2-7 and 9-20 depend from claims 21 and 22, and therefore also are not obvious in view of Motoyama et al. The rejection, therefore, should be withdrawn.

Sondur et al. disclose a method and implementation for using computer network topology objects. Sondur et al. identifies devices on a computer network and creates associated topology objects configured to represent the devices, which are stored, managed, and updated. Sondur et al. do not disclose or suggest adapting the topology as a framework for searching resources. That is, Sondur et al. do not disclose a framework, stored on computer-readable media, for creating a search system, including an abstraction layer to provide a user with a common interface to heterogeneous network objects, as recited in claim 22. Rather, Sondur et al. disclose a topology representing devices, used for device management. Sondur et al. do not disclose an abstraction layer that includes source/resource API defined through at least one virtual NetResource class, or a tree of

Application No. 10/082,525
Amendment

Page 10

accessible/searchable objects built of NetResource types, also as recited in claim 22. NetResource types are defined as representing the source/resource API through a set of virtual functions, and the NetResource class is defined as creating the abstraction layer between a common set of functions in the API and specific implementations that support the API. Sondur et al. require complete representation of network devices. In contrast, the claimed invention does not require complete representation, and is not limited to devices, providing instead an interface to heterogeneous network objects.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Sondur et al. do not render obvious the invention as recited in claim 22. Claims 19 and 20 depend from claim 22, and therefore also are not obvious in view of Motoyama et al. The rejection, therefore, should be withdrawn.

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that all objections and rejections have been overcome. It is therefore requested that the Amendment be entered, the claims allowed, and the case passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas M. Champagne
Registration No. 36,478
IP STRATEGIES
12 1/2 Wall Street
Suite I
Asheville, North Carolina 28801
828.253.8600
828.253.8620 fax

November 11, 2004
Date

TMC:hlp